

MS#160297.1 (4936)
PATENT**REMARKS**

Applicant has thoroughly considered the Final Office action and the Examiner's responses. Applicant has amended the application to more clearly set forth the invention. Claims 1-51 are presented in the application for further examination. Claims 1-5, 7, 18, 21, 28, 35, 38, 41, 43-44 and 47 have been amended by this Amendment C. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks, which follow the order of Examiner's "Response to Arguments", is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b)

Claims 1-4, 8, 14-17, 21, 27, 30 and 44-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Malamud et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,694,561 ("Malamud patent"). In particular, the Examiner argues that (a) the individual windows in a project group are independent of each other because they each have a separate link to the scope window and can be opened and closed individually (see page 25 of the Final Office action referring to FIG. 8; menu 807; Minimize → Window or Close; col. 11, lines 48-50), and (b) the rejected claims fail to recite a drill down tree structure of the entire tree (see page 25 of the Final Office action). Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner's interpretation of the Malamud patent as the present invention discloses **objects linking** independency within a window, not **window** independency among windows.

Referring to Examiner's argument (a) above, amended claim 1 recites "forming a first primary display window in response to the selected scope item for displaying one or more first primary objects which are **dynamically linked** to the scope window; and forming a second primary display window in response to the selected scope item for displaying one or more second primary objects which are **dynamically linked** to the scope window, **wherein the link from the first primary objects to the scope window is independent of the link from the second primary objects to the scope window**, and wherein the scope window persists displaying scope items in the scope window after forming the first primary display window and the second primary display window." In other words, the present invention as recited in claim 1 discloses dynamic and independent links between objects (e.g., first primary objects) and the

MS#160297.1 (4936)
PATENT

scope window, not a mere window independency as disclosed by the Malamud patent.¹ The present invention also discloses that "Dynamic linking means that content of windows, the placement of windows and the relationship between windows can be created, defined and controlled by administrators or users" (Specification of the application, p. 1).

In contrast, the Malamud patent fails to disclose such dynamic and independent links. As relied by the Examiner, FIG. 8 and col. 11, lines 48-50 of the Malamud patent merely disclose the ability for a user to close all of the window to the project group or just window 801. The Malamud patent is silent with respect to dynamic and independent linking of the objects (e.g., Arsenic, Quartz, etc.) of the Mineral Project as described in the present invention (see Footnote 1). For example in FIG. 2, the Malamud patent fails to disclose that when a user creates two windows 203 by selecting "Quartz" in window 201 twice, each window 203 would be dynamically and independently linked to window 201 and would display objects independently.

Referring to Examiner's argument (b) above, amended claim 1 recites "forming a scope window displaying in a hierarchical structure a plurality of scope items...." For example, with a scope window, a first primary display window and a second primary display window, "th[is] multipane navigation model allows a user to double-click on a pane to select an item, move one level down in the scope tree and redisplay details about the selected item. This allows the user to quickly drill down through a hierarchy of containment without being forced to moving the cursor (mouse) around to find what they want" (Specification, p. 9, lines 13-18).

However, the Malamud patent fails to disclose that a drill-down display of scope items. For example, project group 705 in FIG. 7 is a sub-project group within the Mineral Project Group. In order for the Malamud patent to read on amended claim 1, Mineral Project Group window 701 would also display objects in the sub-project group 705 showing the hierarchical

¹ Lines 2-16 on page 8 of the Application disclose the independent linking of first primary objects and the scope window: "The user may select the scope items to be displayed in the scope window. Alternatively, limited items may be available for display or the scope window may be predefined. For example, an application developer may designate the scope items to be displayed in the scope window. Next, a first primary display window 204 (a child window of scope window 202) is formed by selecting a scope item (e.g. scope item 2 designated by reference character 218). Window 204 displays first primary objects 1.1-1.M which are linked to the scope window 202. In general, the scope window 202 and/or a selected item 218 in the scope window 202 drives the first primary display window 204. In addition, a second primary display window 206 displaying secondary scope objects 1.1'-1.M' linked to the scope window 202 is also formed by selecting the same or another scope item. The scope window 202 and/or a selected item 218 in the scope window 202 drives the second primary display window 206. According to the invention, the second primary objects of the second primary display window 206 are independent of the first primary objects of the first primary display window 204 so that window 206 is driven independently of window 204."

MS#160297.1 (4936)
PATENT

structure of the Mineral Project Group 701. As such, the Malamud patent fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits amended claim 1 is distinguishable over the Malamud patent and is patentable. Claims 2-4, 8, and 14-17 depend from claim 1 and each recites distinguishable features. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) of claims 1-4, 8, and 14-17 be withdrawn and allowance of which is respectfully requested.

Similarly, amended claim 21 recites "a method comprising ... retrieving scope items for display in a **hierarchical structure** in the scope window...; retrieving first primary objects **which are dynamically** linked to the scope window for display in the first primary display window...; and retrieving second primary objects **which are dynamically** linked to the scope window for display in the second primary display window wherein the second primary objects are independent of the first primary objects." Claim 27 depends from claim 21 and provides additional feature to claim 21. Therefore, Applicant submits that the Malamud patent fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 21 and 27 and allowance of which is respectfully requested.

Also, claim 30 depends from claim 28, which provides similar recital as claim 21. Claim 28 also recites, "**dynamically linking** the first primary objects to the selected scope item in accordance with instructions from the user or administrator, **said instructions from the user or administrator control the display of the first primary display window...**" Applicant submits that the Malamud patent fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 28 and 30. Therefore, rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn.

Amended claim 44 provides a similar recital as amended claim 21 and further recites "defining window types of the first primary display window and of the second primary display window as a function of data driven from a query, wherein the type of driven data determines the window type." Claims 45-46 depend from and further limit claim 44. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 44-46 recite features that are distinguishable over the Malamud patent and are thus patentable. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 41-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Miklos, IJS Patent No. 5,226,117 ("Miklos patent"). Examiner notes that while the feature of providing a drill down hierarchy display of the items within the scope is supported in the specification of the Application, claims 41-43 fail to recite such feature.

MS#160297.1 (4936)
PATIENT

To set forth the present invention more clearly, Applicant has amended claim 41 to recite "forming a scope window displaying in a **hierarchical structure** scope items therein; forming a first primary display window displaying first primary objects which are **dynamically linked** to the scope window; forming a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects which are **dynamically linked** to the first primary display window, and **dynamically linking** the first secondary display window to the scope window so that the first secondary display window communicates with the scope window by focusing on the selected first secondary objects in the scope window, wherein the communication is independent of the communication between the first primary display window and the scope window."

The Miklos patent, on the other hand, fails to disclose displaying of objects in a hierarchical structure in a parent window. For example, FIG. 8 shows the People Directory window 100 and the personal address book window 110. The window 100 displays items such as PERSONAL, PUBLIC, etc., and the window 110 displays an entry (e.g., Mary Jones) within the personal address book. Applicant argues that the window 100 should not be interpreted as the scope window of the present invention because the Miklos patent fails to display Mary Jones entry in the window 100 showing the hierarchy of the personal address book (i.e., Mary Jones is an entry of the personal address book). By displaying the scope items in a hierarchical structure (as shown in FIG. 3 of the Application), the present invention provides a distinguishable feature such that a user may quickly drill down through a hierarchy of scope items without being forced to moving the cursor (mouse) around to find what they want or open separate windows, as in the Miklos patent.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 41, as amended, is patentable over the Miklos patent and thus should be allowed. Claim 42 depends from claim 41 and further limits 41, and therefore, is also patentable.

Similarly, amended claim 43 provides similar recitals as claim 41 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons presented above.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Malamud patent in view of the Miklos patent. The Examiner argues that the feature Applicant relied upon was not recited in the claims. As such, Applicant clarifies the present invention by

MS#160297.1 (4/36)
PATENT

amending claim 5 to recite in part, "forming a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the first primary display window, **wherein the scope window displays and focuses on a selected one of the displayed first secondary objects**, dynamically linking the first secondary display window to the scope window so that a command or selection in the first secondary display window **changes the focus or content of the scope window.**"

Furthermore, Applicant argues that the Miklos patent fails to teach or suggest such feature recited in claim 5. For example, in FIG. 4 of the Miklos patent, entry "Mary Jones" is focused in window 30 (as shown by box 71). However, FIG. 4 fails to teach or suggest that while the "Mary Jones" entry is focused in window 30, the same entry in window 100 would also be focused. Because the Miklos patent fails to display objects in a hierarchical structure in window 100, the Miklos patent would not be able to display, not along focus, on the entry "Mary Jones".

Such additional feature, as amended, is distinguishable over the Miklos patent, the Malamud patent, and the combined reference. Claims 6-7 depend from claim 5 which further limits claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests rejection of claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-13, 18-20, 22-26, 28, and 31-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Malamud patent in view of Ku, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,421,072 ("Ku patent"). In addressing this rejection, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 18, 21, 28, 35, and 38 to further set forth the invention. In particular, amended claim 1 recites, in part: "... wherein the scope window **persists displaying scope items after forming the first primary display window and the second primary display window.**"

Applicant respectfully argues that the Ku patent teaches away from the present invention by failing to persistently display objects in a hierarchical structure in a parent window. For example, in FIG. 2, window 210 initially displays objects in a hierarchical structure in window 210. In FIG. 3, however, when a user chooses to display the subtree of Node "C" 360 in window 315, window 310 no longer displays objects in the subtree structure of Node "C" 360.

In the contrary, the present invention, as recited in amended claim 1, discloses that the scope window displays in a hierarchical structure a plurality of scope items. In addition, the scope window persists displaying scope items after forming the first primary display window and the second primary display window. As such, the present invention advantageously provides an

MS#160297.1 (4/36)
PATENT

overall multi-tree navigation of objects in the scope window while allowing a user to retrieve an object in the hierarchical structure in the first primary display window.

Additionally, amended claim 1 further recites that "forming a first primary display window in response to the selected scope item for displaying one or more first primary objects which are **dynamically linked** to the scope window; and forming a second primary display window in response to the selected scope items for displaying one or more second primary objects which are **dynamically linked** to the scope window...." While the Ku patent discloses that window 415 has a visual link 470 to window 410 and window 420 has a visual link 472 to window 415 in FIG. 4, the Ku patent fails to teach or suggest that window 420 would link independently to window 410 (see discussion of object linking independency above). Furthermore, the Ku patent fails to teach or suggest that visual links 470 and 472 are dynamic links, that is, a user who creates window 415 may dynamically link to window 415 to window 410 to control the display of objects in window 415.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined reference fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1. Hence, allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested. Claims 9-13 depend from claim 1 and further recite additional features. Therefore, rejection of claims 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Similarly, amended claims 18, 21, 28, 35 and 38 recite similar recitals, and the combined reference of the Malamud and Ku patents fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 18, 21, 28, 35 and 38. Claims 19-20, 22-26, 31-34, 36-37 and 39-40 depend from their respective independent claims and provide additional features to the respective independent claims. As such, rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claims 18-20, 22-26, 28 and 31-40 should be withdrawn.

Claims 28 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Miklos patent in view of the Ku patent. Examiner cites FIG. 3, col. 4 lines 28-37 and lines 60-65 of the Ku patent and col. 2, lines 23-45, col. 5, line 49- col. 6, line 8 of the Miklos patent for support of the Examiner's argument. Applicant respectfully disagrees with these interpretations of the references and argues that the combined reference fails to teach or suggest dynamic linking between the first/second primary display window and the scope window in accordance with instructions from a user or an administrator.

MS#160297.1 (4936)
PATENT

Amended claim 28 recites "dynamically linking the first primary objects to the selected scope item in accordance with instructions from the user or administrator, **said instructions from the user or administrator controls the display of first primary objects in the first primary display window...**; dynamically linking the second primary objects to the selected scope item in accordance with instructions from the user or administrator, **said instructions from the user or administrator controls the display of second primary objects in the second primary display window....**" In other words, the user or administrator may pass a parameter, as recited in claim 29, to control the display of objects in the first/second primary display window.

Column 4, lines 28-37 and 60-65 of the Ku patent, as relied by the Examiner, fails to disclose that a user or an administrator may control the display of window 315 by providing instructions. In fact, the relied texts merely disclose how a user may create a new separate window 315 to display subtree of Node "C" 360 while continuing to provide a visual link 370 back to window 310. The Ku patent fails to disclose that a user may, in creating window 315, control which objects in subtree Node "C" 360 should be displayed. Similarly, the relied texts in the Miklos patent also fail to disclose controlling of display of window 41 or 51 in accordance with instructions from the user or administrator. Column 2, lines 23-45 of the Miklos patent discloses simultaneous updating such that "once all occurrences of the data within the hierarchically and logically related windows have been identified, the simultaneous update of the data within all related windows is performed" (lines 41-45). Applicant argues that this simultaneous updating of data of the Miklos patent is irrelevant to having instructions from the user or administrator to control the display of first/second primary objects in the first or second primary display window, as recited in amended claim 28.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined reference of the Miklos and Ku patents fails to disclose each and every element of claims 28 and 29 and that amended claims 28 and 29 are patentable over the combined reference. Allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 47-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Malamud patent in view of the U.S. Patent No. 6,008,809 ("Brooks patent"). Claims 48 and 49 depend from and further limit independent claim 47 which will be discussed below. To more clearly set forth the invention, Applicant has amended claim 47 to recite "a first primary display

MS#160297.1 (49:16)
PATENT

window displaying first primary objects linked to the scope window and having an edge adjacent to an edge of the scope window, wherein the size and position of the scope window are independent of the size and position of the first primary display window; and a second primary display window displaying second primary objects linked to the scope window and having an edge adjacent to an edge of the scope window or an edge of the primary window wherein adjacent edges are docked to each other so that movement of one adjacent edge causes movement of the other adjacent edge, wherein the size and position of the scope window and the first primary display window are independent of the size and position of the second primary display window."

In other words, in order to avoid overlapping of the scope window and the first primary display window, a user may dock one edge of the first primary display window to an edge of the scope window. However, the size and position of the scope window do not depend on the size and position of the first primary display window as the scope window may overlap the first primary display window ("Although the user may configure windows to be overlapping, it would be preferable that the edge of each window frame be docked to the edge of an adjacent window" (Specification, page 25, lines 6-8).

On the other hand, the Brooks patent provides dynamically sized windows by allowing a user to drag and drop one or more application windows to a dynamic window. For example, in FIG. 12, a dynamic window 212 is shown containing the watermelon.doc window 502, the honeydew.dbf window 504 and the cantaloupe.spd window 506. The Brooks patent teaches away from the present invention by disclosing that "[a]s mentioned previously, any application window dropped into dynamic window 212 is dynamically sized in proportion to other windows already located within dynamic window 212" (emphasis added) (col. 9, lines 52-55). In other words, the size and position of the application windows in the dynamic window depend on other application windows that may be added to or removed from the dynamic window.

Contrarily, the present invention does not require a dynamic window for the first primary display window to dock or "snap" to the scope window so that movement of one adjacent edge of the first primary display window causes movement of the other adjacent edge of the scope window. Furthermore, the size and position of the scope window are independent from the size and position of the first primary display window because they are not confined by the boundaries of the dynamic window. In addition, the edges of the scope window may overlap the edges of

MS#160297.1 (4936)
PATENT

the first primary display window, which is contrary to the dynamically sized feature in the Brooks patent. Therefore, Applicant submits that the combined reference of the Malamud and Brooks patent fails to disclose each and every element of claims 47-48. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

MSFT 4936(160297.1)
PATIENT**CONCLUSION**

It is felt that a full and complete response has been made to the Final Office action and, as such, places the application in condition for allowance. Such allowance is hereby respectfully requested. If the Examiner feels, for any reason, that a personal interview will expedite the prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Applicant does not believe that a fee is due. If, however, the Commissioner determines otherwise, such fees may be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank R. Agovino, Reg. No. 27,416
SENNIGER, POWERS, LEAVITT & ROEDEL
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

FRA/ATY